REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are currently pending in the present application, of which Claims 1 and 6 have been amended.

Paragraph 0033 has been corrected as suggested by the Examiner. Thus, the objection to the specification is believed to be overcome.

The phrase "in response to said identifier token" in Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to "in response to said received identifier token." Also, the comma in Claims 1 and 6 have been changed to a colon to include all the indented steps "in response to said received identifier token." Thus, the claim objection is believed to be overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Smith et al.* (US 2002/0016639) in view of *Hodge* (US 6,715,141), *Hibdon* (US 2002/01293411) and *Andrews et al.* (US 5,768,564). Applicant respectfully traverses such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

Amended Claim 1 (and similarly Claim 6) now recites a step of "receiving an identifier token from source code" and a step of "in response to said received identifier token matching a macro identifier stored in a symbol table..." On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the above-mentioned two steps are disclosed by *Smith* in paragraph 0242 and in Figure 93. However, according to *Smith*, macros (instead of the claimed identifier token) are transformed by a preprocessor to corresponding predefined strings as set forth in a macro table. Thus, the claimed step of "receiving an identifier token from source code" is not taught or suggested by *Smith*.

In addition, according to Claim 1, if the received identifier token matches a macro identifier stored in a symbol table, then five steps will be performed, and they are "replacing said identifier token with a macro form token corresponding to said identifier token from said symbol

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111   Page 6   RA000122.AM1

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

table," "sending said macro form token to a glue routine," "invoking a macro invocation parser by said glue routine," "transferring tokens to said macro invocation parser via said glue routine until a completion of said macro invocation," and "sending a macro body definition of said macro to a lexer by said macro invocation parser."

On pages 3-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts the above-mentioned five claimed steps are disclosed by *Hodge*, *Hibdon* and *Andrews*. As mentioned above, *Smith* teaches macros to be transformed into corresponding predefined strings. Assuming *arguendo* that the Examiner's characterization of *Smith*'s "predefined strings" are the same as the claimed macro form token, none of the cited references teaches or suggests the claimed step of sending "predefined strings" to a glue routine, and the claimed step of invoking a macro invocation parser by the glue routine.

Furthermore, the Examiner has cited four separate references to reject the claimed invention; however, the Examiner has not provided any motivation from any of the references for modification. Thus, it is apparent that one of the reasons the Examiner arrived at the above-mentioned assertions is that the Examiner had reconstructed the claimed invention from the prior art by using Applicant's claim as a "blueprint." The Examiner cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among disclosures in the prior art to make the § 103 rejection. Thus, the cited references cannot be combined for the § 103 rejection unless some nexus between the cited references can be provided by the Examiner, especially when none of the cited references is related to assembly programming.

Claims 2-5 (and similarly Claims 7-10) recites that the claimed receiving, replacing, transferring and sending steps should be performed by a lexer. On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the lexer is covered by cited references. However, the term lexer was never mentioned in any of cited references. Thus, it is clear that none of the cited references teaches or suggests Claims 2-5.

Because the cited references, whether considered separately or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed invention, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111   Page 7   RA000122.AM1

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-10 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicant believes that independent Claims 1 and 6 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any addition fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of the present application, please charge it against IBM Deposit Account No. 09-0464.

Respectfully submitted,

Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111   Page 8   RA000122.AM1